



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/688,363

10/17/2003

James McCahill Denny JR.

10785-41972

2281

24728 7590 08/05/2008  
MORRIS MANNING MARTIN LLP  
3343 PEACHTREE ROAD, NE  
1600 ATLANTA FINANCIAL CENTER  
ATLANTA, GA 30326

EXAMINER

RAJ, RAJIV J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

08/05/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/688,363	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DENNY ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> RAJIV J. RAJ	<b>Art Unit</b> 3626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **Detailed Action**

### **Status of Claims**

1. This action is in reply to the application filed on 17 October 2003.
2. Claims 1-21 are currently pending and have been examined.

### **Priority**

3. Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101**

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Based on Supreme Court precedent, a method/process claim must (1) be tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) (see at least *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing (see at least *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 71 (1972)). A method/process claim that fails to meet one of the above requirements is not in compliance with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 for patent eligible subject matter. Here claims 1-21 fail to meet the above requirements because the limitations fail to tie the method to another statutory class of invention. Nominal recitations of structure in an otherwise ineligible method fail to make the method a

Art Unit: 3626

statutory process. See *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 71-72. As *Comiskey* recognized, "the mere use of the machine to collect data necessary for application of the mental process may not make the claim patentable subject matter." *Comiskey*, 499 F.3d at 1380 (citing *In re Grams*, 888 F.2d 835, 839-40 (Fed. Cir. 1989)). Incidental physical limitations, such as data gathering, field of use limitations, and post-solution activity are not enough to convert an abstract idea into a statutory process. In other words, nominal or token recitations of structure in a method claim do not convert an otherwise ineligible claim into an eligible one.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 1-8 & 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Little et al.* (US 5350509) (hereinafter *Little*) in view of *Chapman et al.* (US 6879959 B1) (hereinafter *Chapman*) in further view of *Provost et al.* (US 6341265) (hereinafter *Provost*).

9. **Examiner's Note:** The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in

Art Unit: 3626

preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

**Claim 1****Little as shown, discloses the following limitations:**

- *wherein each rejected claim listed is a link to associated detailed claim information; (see at least Little Column:17 Lines:34-41)*
- *in response to receipt of edited claim information, perform a rules verification against the edited claim information; (see at least Little Fig:6 Items:25, 256-268 & related text)*

Little does not disclose the following limitation, however Chapman, as shown, does:

- *receiving practice identifying information; (see at least Chapman Fig:1 Items:100-110, 140 & related text)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

Little & Chapman do not disclose the following limitations, however Provost, as shown, does:

- *in response to receiving the practice identifying information, displaying a claim status summary that links directly to a rejected claim listing; (see at least Provost Fig:4A Item:82 & related text)*
- *in response to an activation of a rejected claim listing link, displaying the rejected claim listing; (see at least Provost Fig:4A Item:82 & related text)*
- *in response to an activation of a listed rejection claim link, displaying the associated detailed claim information; (see at least Provost Fig:4A Item:82 & related text)*
- *wherein a detailed claim information display has fields to edit the associated detailed claim information; (see at least Provost Fig:2 & 3 & related text)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the features of Provost into Little/Chapman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added these features into Little/Chapman with the motivation of providing a more efficient, cost-effective and accurate process for preparing, submitting, correcting, and adjudicating health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Provost Column:3 Lines:24-38)

**Claim 2**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Little further discloses the following limitations:

- *associating an easy to understand description with the new rejection code;* (see at least Little Column:2 Lines:1-13, Column:11 Lines:1-2 & Column:17 Lines:43-67)
- *displaying the easy to understand description;* (see at least Little Appendix:1, Fig:1 Item:28 & related text)

**Claim 3**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Little further discloses the following limitations:

- *profiling a payer response to determine a corresponding pattern;* (see at least Little Column:7 Lines:49-54)
- *generating an alert when the payer response has not been received within limits determined by the corresponding pattern;* (see at least Little Column:7 Lines:49-54)

**Claim 4**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 1. Little further discloses:

- *categorizing a new rejection code that is not in the claim management database into a general rejection category;* (see at least Little Column:2 Lines:1-13)
- *displaying the general rejection category;* (see at least Little Column:17 Lines:20-42 Fig:17 & related text)

Little does not disclose the following limitations, however Chapman, as shown, does:

Art Unit: 3626

- *receiving claim rejection data; (see at least Chapman Fig:1 Item:100 & related text)*
- *analyzing the claim rejection data to determine if a rejection code is in a claim management database; (see at least Chapman Fig:7 Items740,750 & related text)*
- *determine the general rejection category for a rejected claim; (see at least Chapman Fig:6 Item:610 & related text)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the features of Chapman into Little. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added these features into Little with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

**Claim 5**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 4. Chapman further discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein the step of determining the general rejection category includes selecting from a group consisting of eligibility errors, duplicate claim errors, provider enrollment errors, coding errors: patient demographic errors, and payer information errors; (see at least Chapman Column:6 Lines:6-18)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little/Chapman/Provost. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little/Chapman/Provost with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

**Claim 6**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 4. Chapman further discloses the following limitation:

- *adding a new rule verification in response to receipt of the new rejection code; (see at least Chapman Fig:15b Items:1502-1508 & related text)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little/Chapman/Provost. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little/Chapman/Provost with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

#### **Claim 7**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 4. Little further discloses:

- *storing the new claim information;* (see at least Little Fig:6 Item:25 & related text)

Little does not disclose the following limitation, however Chapman, as shown, does:

- *receiving new claim information;* (see at least Chapman Fig:1 Item:100 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little/Chapman/Provost. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little/Chapman/Provost with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

Little & Chapman does not disclose the following limitations, however Provost, as shown, does:

- *maintaining a claim history wherein any information associated with the new claims is edited, the edit information is stored and retrievable;* (see at least Provost Fig:1 Items:10-20 Fig:4B Item:98 & related text)
- *in response to a request, displaying all associated edits;* (see at least Provost Fig:4B Items:92-104 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the features of Provost into Little/Chapman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added these features into Little/Chapman with the motivation of providing a more efficient, cost-effective and accurate process for preparing, submitting, correcting, and adjudicating health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Provost Column:3 Lines:24-38)



**Claim 8**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 7. Little further discloses:

- *performing rules verification against the new claim information;* (see at least Little Fig:6 Items:25,356-268 & related text)
- *providing a rejected claim report;* (see at least Little Fig:6 Items:254,272 & related text)

**Claim 14**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 9. Little further discloses:

- *storing the new claim information;* (see at least Little Fig:6 Item:25)

Little does not disclose the following limitation, however Chapman, as shown, does:

- *receiving new claim information;* (see at least Chapman Fig:1 Item:100)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

Little & Chapman does not disclose the following limitations, however Provost, as shown, does:

- *maintaining a claim history wherein any information associated with the new claims is edited, the edit information is stored and retrievable;* (see at least Provost Fig:1 Items:10-20 Fig:4B Item:98 & related text)
- *in response to a request, displaying all associated edits;* (see at least Provost Fig:4B Items:92-104 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the features of Provost into Little/Chapman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added these features into Little/Chapman with the motivation of providing a more efficient, cost-effective and accurate

Art Unit: 3626

process for preparing, submitting, correcting, and adjudicating health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Provost Column:3 Lines:24-38)

#### **Claim 15**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 14. Little further discloses:

- *performing rules verification against the new claim information;* (see at least Little Fig:6 Items:25,356-268 & related text)
- *providing a rejected claim report;* (see at least Little Fig:6 Items:254,272 & related text)

#### **Claim 16**

**Little as shown, discloses the following limitations:**

- *storing the new claim information;* (see at least Little Fig:6 Item:25 & related text)
- *performing rules verification against the new claim information;* (see at least Little Fig:6 Items:25,356-268 & related text)
- *providing a rejected claim report;* (see at least Little Fig:6 Items:254,272 & related text)

Little does not disclose the following limitation, however Chapman, as shown, does:

- *receiving new claim information;* (see at least Chapman Fig:1 Item:100 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

Little & Chapman does not disclose the following limitations, however Provost, as shown, does:

- *receiving claim edit information associated with the new claim;* (see at least Provost Fig:4B Item:98 & related text)
- *maintaining a claim history wherein any time information associated with the new claims is edited, the edit information is stored and retrievable;* (see at least Provost Fig:1 Items:10-20 Fig:4B Item:98 & related text)

Art Unit: 3626

- *in response to a request, displaying a claim history report that provides the claim history that shows all associated edits;* (see at least Provost Fig:4B Items:92-104 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the features of Provost into Little/Chapman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added these features into Little/Chapman with the motivation of providing a more efficient, cost-effective and accurate process for preparing, submitting, correcting, and adjudicating health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Provost Column:3 Lines:24-38)

#### **Claim 17**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 16. Little further discloses:

- *submitting the new claim to a payment processing system;* (see at least Little Fig:3 Item:200 & related text)
- *associating an easy to understand description with the new rejection code;* (see at least Little Column:2 Lines:1-13, Column:11 Lines:1-2 & Column:17 Lines:43-67)
- *displaying the easy to understand description;* (see at least Little Appendix:1, Fig:1 Item:28 & related text)

Little does not disclose the following limitation, however Chapman, as shown, does:

- *receiving claim rejection data that include a rejection code from the payment processing system;* (see at least Chapman Fig:7 Items:700,720 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

#### **Claim 18**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 16. Little further discloses the following limitations:

Art Unit: 3626

- *profiling a payer response to determine a corresponding pattern;* (see at least Little Column:7 Lines:49-54)
- *generating an alert when the payer response has not been received within limits determined by the corresponding pattern;* (see at least Little Column:7 Lines:49-54)

#### **Claim 19**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 17. Little further discloses:

- *categorizing a new rejection code that is not in the claim management database into a general rejection category;* (see at least Little Column:2 Lines:1-13)
- *displaying the general rejection category;* (see at least Little Column:17 Lines:20-42 Fig:17 & related text)

Little does not disclose the following limitations, however Chapman, as shown, does:

- *analyzing the claim rejection data to determine if a rejection code is in a claim management database;* (see at least Chapman Fig:7 Items740,750 & related text)
- *determine the general rejection category for a rejected claim;* (see at least Chapman Fig:6 Item:610 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

#### **Claim 20**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 19. Chapman further discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein the step of determining the general rejection category includes selecting from a group consisting of eligibility errors, duplicate claim errors, provider enrollment errors,*

Art Unit: 3626

*coding errors: patient demographic errors, and payer information errors;* (see at least Chapman Column:6 Lines:6-18)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little/Chapman/Provost. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little/Chapman/Provost with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

**Claim 21**

The combination of Little/Chapman/Provost discloses all the limitations of Claim 19. Chapman further discloses the following limitation:

- *adding a new rule verification in response to receipt of the new rejection code;* (see at least Chapman Fig:15b Items:1502-1508 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little/Chapman/Provost. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little/Chapman/Provost with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

10. Claims 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Little et al. in view of Chapman.

**Claim 9**

**Little as shown, discloses the following limitations:**

- *categorizing a new rejection code that is not in the claim management database into a general rejection category;* (see at least Little Column:2 Lines:1-13)
- *displaying a claim rejection summary that includes the general rejection category;* (see at least Little Column:17 Lines:20-42 Fig:17 & related text)

Little does not disclose the following limitation, however Chapman, as shown, does:

Art Unit: 3626

- *receiving claim rejection data over a global computer network;* (see at least Chapman Fig:1 Item:100 & related text)
- *analyzing the claim rejection data to determine if a rejection code is in a claim management database;* (see at least Chapman Fig:7 Items:740, 750 & related text)
- *determine the general rejection category for a rejected claim;* (see at least Chapman Fig:6 Item:610 & related text)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the features of Chapman into Little. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added these features into Little with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

#### **Claim 10**

The combination of Little/Chapman discloses all the limitations of Claim 9. Little further discloses the following limitations:

- *associating an easy to understand description with the new rejection code;* (see at least Little Column:2 Lines:1-13, Column:11 Lines:1-2 & Column:17 Lines:43-67)
- *displaying the easy to understand description;* (see at least Little Appendix:1, Fig:1 Item:28 & related text)

#### **Claim 11**

The combination of Little/Chapman discloses all the limitations of Claim 9. Little further discloses the following limitations:

- *profiling a payer response to determine a corresponding pattern;* (see at least Little Column:7 Lines:49-54)
- *generating an alert when the payer response has not been received within limits determined by the corresponding pattern;* (see at least Little Column:7 Lines:49-54)

#### **Claim 12**

Art Unit: 3626

The combination of Little/Chapman discloses all the limitations of Claim 9. Chapman further discloses the following limitation:

- *wherein the step of determining the general rejection category includes selecting from a group consisting of eligibility errors, duplicate claim errors, provider enrollment errors, coding errors: patient demographic errors, and payer information errors; (see at least Chapman Column:6 Lines:6-18)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little/Chapman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little/Chapman with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

**Claim 13**

The combination of Little/Chapman discloses all the limitations of Claim 9. Chapman further discloses the following limitation:

- *adding a new rule verification in response to receipt of the new rejection code; (see at least Chapman Fig:15b Items:1502-1508 & related text)*

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of Chapman into Little/Chapman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have added this feature into Little/Chapman with the motivation of providing a more efficient and accurate process for receiving, monitoring, editing, storing, and rating medical and health claims for improved medical care. (see at least Chapman Column:2 Lines:6-23)

Art Unit: 3626

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to **Rajiv J. Raj** whose telephone number is **571-270-3930**. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, **Luke Gilligan** can be reached at **571.272.6770**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair> <<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866.217.9197** (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to **571-273-8300**.

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the **United States Patent and Trademark**

**Office Customer Service Window:**

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314.

Date: 07/28/08

/Rajiv J Raj/ Patent Examiner Art Unit 3626

/Robert Morgan/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3626